## IN THE HIGH COURT OF SIKKIM

ORDER SHEET

Petitioner/Appellant

Versus

State of Sikkim

Serial No. of Order	Date of Order	Order with Signature	Office Note as to section (if any) taken on Order
	6.2000	Present: Mr. T. B. Thapa with Mr. Bhaskaf Raj Pradhan, Advocates for the appellant.  Mr. S. P. Wangdi, Advocate General with Mr. Karma Thinlay, Asstt.Govt. Advocate for the respondent.  Heard. Admit.  Issue notice to the respondents.  The matter be listed for hearing on 25th July, 2000 as prayed for by the appellant.  C.M.A.146/2000  Heard on the application moved by	Title corrected  with on 12.6.2  office 12.6.200  as come with  Kenana Compa
		the appellant for stay of the judgment and order passed by the learned District Judge, Special Division whereby the award passed in favour of the appellant was set aside, inter alia, on the ground that the agreement for referring the matter between the parties was against the provisions of sub-sections (1).  (2) and (3) of Section 56 of the Trade and Merchandise Marks Act, 1958.  One of the prayers made in the stay application is that the respondent may be restrained from using the 77 trade: marks	

Office Note as to Serial. Date Order with Signature action (if any) of No. of taken on Order Order Order in relation to the lotteries until the disposal of the Appeal. After hearing learned Counsel for the parties, we do not consider it to be a fit case where we should stay the operation of the impugned order dated 29th April, 2000 passed by the learned District Judge, Special Division. Gangtok and restrain the respondents from using the 77 trade marks in relation to its lotteries. If any order of stay as prayed for by the appellant is granted, and in case the appeal is dismissed, the State will lose its revenue only on account of the order of the Court. However, we permit the appellant to participate in relation to the tender which, if invited, in respect of 77 trade marks in relation to the lotteries to participate. without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the parties. n. Jum ( A. Deb ) ( R. Dayal ) Chief Justice Judge.

Serial	Date		Office Note as to
No. of Order	of Order	Order with Signature	action (if any) taken on Order
2.	11-7-20	00 Present: Mr. T.B. Thapa with Mr. Bhaskar Raj Pradhan, Advocates for the appellant.	
-40		Mr. S.P. Wangdi, Advocate General with Mr. Karma Thinlay, Asstt. Govt. Advocate for the respondent.	
		This case has been fixed for	
		hearing on 25-7-2000. It is made clear that	
		this case will be heard on 25-7-2000 and	
		adjournment will not be given on that date	
	2	on any ground.	
		The application for adjournment	
		is rejected.	
		(Anup Deb)	
		Acting Chief Justice.	
3. 25	.7.200	Present : Mr. T. B. Thapa, Advocate for the appellant.	
		Mr. S. P. Wangdi, Advocate General with Mr. Karma Thinlay, Asstt.Govt.Advocate for the respondent.	
		Heard arguments in part.	
		Be listed on 26.07.2000 for further arguments on top of the list.	
		M M. SWAM	
		(A. Deb ) (R. Dayal ) Judge Chief Justice.	
	-==		
740	-		
4. 20	.7.200	Present : Mr. T.B. Thapa with Mr. Bhaskar	
		Raj Pradhan, Advocates for the appellant.	
		apportance	
-			

Serial lo. of order	Date of Order	Order with Signature	Office Note as to action (if any) taken on Order
		Mr. S.P. Wangdi, Advocate General with Mr. Karma Thinlay, Asstt. Govt. Advocate for the respondent.	
			*
		Heard arguments in part.	
		The learned Counsel for the	
		appellant requests for a date to prepare the	
		Case. With the consent of the learned	
		Counsel for the parties, the matter is	
		adjourned for hearing to 31-7-2000.	
		The matter be listed on the top of the list.	
		che list.	
		(A. Deb) (R. Dayal) Judge. Chief Justice 26-7-2000 26-7-2000	*,*
31.	7.2000	Present: Mr. T. B. Thapa with Mr. Bhaskar Raj Pradhan, Advocates for the appellant.	
		Mr. S. P. Wangdi, Advocate General with Mr. Karma Thinlay, Asstt.Govt. Advocate for the respondent.	
		Heard arguments. Judgment reserved.	
		monnon.	
		(A. Deb ) (R. Dayal ) Judge Chief Justice 31.7.2000 31.7.2000.	

for 27,9,2000 Present: Mr. T. B. Thapa with Mr. Bhaskar Raj Pradhan, Advocates for the appellant.  Mr. S. P. Wangdi, Advocate General with Mr. Karma Thinlay, Asstt.Govt.Advocate for the respondent.  The respondent has moved CMA No. 247/2000 to the effect that the State Government has decided that they will not proceed with the sale of lottery tickets under the 77 disputed lottery names and they undertake to shide by the decision. A prayer has been made for passing necessary orders. The learned Advocate General submits that in view of the decision of the Government, the Government does not press the application filed under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.  Accordingly, the appeal is allowed the impugned judgment and order of the learned trial Judge is set aside and the application under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as not pressed.  Accordingly CR. Dayal CR. Dayal Chief Justice 27.9.2000	Serial Date No. of of Order Order	Order with Signature	Office Note as to action (if any) taken on Order
General with Mr. Karma Thinlay, Asstt.Govt.Advocate for the respondent.  The respondent has moved CMA No.  247/2000 to the effect that the State Government has decided that they will not proceed with the sale of lottery tickets under the 77 disputed lottery names and they undertake to abide by the decision. A prayer has been made for passing necessary orders. The learned Advocate General submits that in view of the decision of the Government, the Government does not press the application filed under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.  Accordingly, the appeal is allowed the impugned judgment and order of the learned trial Judge is set aside and the application under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as not pressed.  A. Deb ) (R. Dayal)  Judge (R. Dayal)  Chief Justice	6. 27.9.2	Raj Pradhan, Advocates for the	
ment has decided that they will not proceed with the sale of lottery tickets under the 77 disputed lottery names and they undertake to abide by the decision. A prayer has been made for passing necessary orders. The learned Advocate General submits that in view of the decision of the Government, the Government does not press the application filed under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.  Accordingly, the appeal is allowed the impugned judgment and order of the learned trial Judge is set aside and the application under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as not pressed.  Accordingly the speal is dismissed as not pressed.  (A. Deb) (R. Dayal) Judge Chief Justice		General with Mr. Karma Thinlay, Asstt.Govt.Advocate for the	
ment has decided that they will not proceed with the sale of lottery tickets under the 77 disputed lottery names and they undertake to abide by the decision. A prayer has been made for passing necessary orders. The learned Advocate General submits that in view of the decision of the Government, the Government does not press the application filed under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.  Accordingly, the appeal is allowed the impugned judgment and order of the learned trial Judge is set aside and the application under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as not pressed.  Accordingly the speal is dismissed as not pressed.  (A. Deb) (R. Dayal) Judge Chief Justice	6		
ment has decided that they will not proceed with the sale of lottery tickets under the 77 disputed lottery names and they under- take to abide by the decision. A prayer has been made for passing necessary orders. The learned Advocate General submits that in view of the decision of the Government, the Government does not press the applica- tion filed under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.  Accordingly, the appeal is allowed the impugned judgment and order of the learned trial Judge is set aside and the application under Section 34 of the Arbitra- tion and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as not pressed.  (A. Deb ) (R. Dayal) Judge Chief Justice			
with the sale of lottery tickets under the 77 disputed lottery names and they undertake to abide by the decision. A prayer has been made for passing necessary orders. The learned Advocate General submits that in view of the decision of the Government. the Government does not press the application filed under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.  Accordingly, the appeal is allowed the impugned judgment and order of the learned trial Judge is set aside and the application under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as not pressed.  (A. Deb ) (R. Dayal) Judge Chief Justice			1-
77 disputed lottery names and they undertake to abide by the decision. A prayer has been made for passing necessary orders. The learned Advocate General submits that in view of the decision of the Government, the Government does not press the application filed under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.  Accordingly, the appeal is allowed the impugned judgment and order of the learned trial Judge is set aside and the application under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as not pressed.  (A. Deb ) (R. Dayal)  Judge (R. Dayal)  Chief Justice			
take to abide by the decision. A prayer has been made for passing necessary orders. The learned Advocate General submits that in view of the decision of the Government, the Government does not press the application filed under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.  Accordingly, the appeal is allowed. As suit the impugned judgment and order of the learned trial Judge is set aside and the application under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as not pressed.  (A. Deb) (R. Dayal)  Judge (R. Dayal)  Chief Justice			
has been made for passing necessary orders.  The learned Advocate General submits that in view of the decision of the Government, the Government does not press the applica- tion filed under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.  Accordingly, the appeal is allowed, the impugned judgment and order of the learned trial Judge is set aside and the application under Section 34 of the Arbitra- tion and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as not pressed.  (A. Deb )  (R. Dayal )  Judge Chief Justice			
The learned Advocate General submits that in view of the decision of the Government, the Government does not press the application filed under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.  Accordingly, the appeal is allowed, the impugned judgment and order of the learned trial Judge is set aside and the application under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as not pressed.  (A. Deb ) (R. Dayal)  Judge (R. Dayal)			
in view of the decision of the Government, the Government does not press the application filed under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.  Accordingly, the appeal is allowed. The impugned judgment and order of the learned trial Judge is set aside and the application under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as not pressed.  (A. Deb )  (R. Dayal) Judge Chief Justice			
the Government does not press the application filed under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.  Accordingly, the appeal is allowed. Her sufficient the impugned judgment and order of the learned trial Judge is set aside and the application under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as not pressed.  (A. Deb ) (R. Dayal)  Judge (R. Dayal)			
Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.  Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.  Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.  They be the learned trial Judge is set aside and the application under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as not pressed.  (A. Deb)  (R. Dayal)  Judge  Chief Justice			
Accordingly, the appeal is allowed. As Judge the impugned judgment and order of the learned trial Judge is set aside and the application under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as not pressed.  (A. Deb)  (R. Dayal)  Judge  Chief Justice			
Accordingly, the appeal is allowed. Judge the impugned judgment and order of the learned trial Judge is set aside and the application under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as hot pressed.  (A. Deb ) (R. Dayal) Judge (R. Dayal)			
Accordingly, the appeal is allowed. Judy the impugned judgment and order of the learned trial Judge is set aside and the application under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as not pressed.  (A. Deb ) (R. Dayal) Judge (R. Dayal)		and Conciliation Act, 1996.	Alopy 5- order
learned trial Judge is set aside and the application under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as not pressed.  (A. Deb ) (R. Dayal) Judge Chief Justice		Accordingly, the appeal is allowed,	hes seet to
application under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as not pressed.  (A. Deb ) (R. Dayal) Judge Chief Justice	- 31	the impugned judgment and order of the	may use
tion and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed as not pressed.  (A. Deb ) (R. Dayal)  Judge Chief Justice		learned trial Judge is set aside and the	
(A. Deb ) (R. Dayal) Judge Chief Justice		application under Section 34 of the Arbitra-	
(A. Deb) (R. Dayal) Judge Chief Justice		tion and Conciliation Act, 1996 is dismissed	
(A. Deb ) (R. Dayal ) Judge Chief Justice		as not pressed.	
(A. Deb ) (R. Dayal) Judge Chief Justice			
Judge Chief Justice		23. 9.2000	